APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/721,982	11/25/2003	Shell S. Simpson	200310228-1	6947

22879   7590   03/25/2008
HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER
KASSA, HILINA S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2625	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/25/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM
mkraft@hp.com
ipa.mail@hp.com

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _21 January 2008_.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) _1-22_ is/are pending in the application.
   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) _1-22_ is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on _25 November 2003_ is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
   a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Applicant's election of Group 1 related to claims 1-22 in the reply filed on

01/21/2008 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point

out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as

an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3.   Claims 1-5, 8, 11-15, 17 and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Kurishita et al. (US Patent Number 7,100,198 B2) in view of

Kawamoto et al. (US Patent Number 6,120,197).

(1) regarding claims 1, 13 and 20:

As shown in figures 4-5, Kurishita et al. disclose a method for controlling a

printing mode (**column 2, lines 1-9; note that a print method for securely printing**

print data is disclosed), the method comprising:

receiving a request *to change a printing mode of a printing device* (**column 5,**
lines 30-34; note that the printing device receives instruction from the host
computer);

generating a signed request that requests changing of the printing mode
(**column 6, lines 11-17; note that there is a generated user information for**
authenticating the print data);

validating the signed request (**column 6, lines 18-25; note that based upon the**
requestors input i.e. user name selected, the user gets validated or authorized);
and

enabling or disabling the printing mode in accordance with the signed request if
the signed request is valid (**column 6, lines 26-32; note that if the data entered in**
valid, the print data stored is transmitted to be printed or executed).

Kurishita et al. disclose all of the subject matter as described as above except for
specifically teaching wherein the authentication is for the purpose of controlling printing
mode rather than printing data.

However, Kawamoto et al. disclose a printer color processing mode automatic
control method (**column 1, lines 57-60; note that printing is in consideration of a**
color processing mode suitable for print data) for the purposes of changing printing
mode according to the print data (**column 2, lines 3-9; note that the color processing**
mode decides the mode of the print data on the basis of the control information
included in the print data).

Kurishita et al. and Kawamoto et al. are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor which is network printing method. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art to have an authentication or control means for changing printing mode. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been in order to save time it takes to change different modes (column 1, lines 47-50). Also, such method also improves print quality (column 1, lines 44-47). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Kurishita et al. with Kawamoto et al. to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1.

(2) regarding claim 2:

Kurishita et al. further disclose the method of claim 1, wherein receiving a request to change a printing mode comprises receiving a request from a service provider who maintains the printing device (**column 11, lines 14-28; note that secure printing is performed also by a particular group i.e. considered as the managing group**).

(3) regarding claims 3 and 14:

Kurishita et al. further disclose the method of claim 1, wherein generating a signed request comprises generating a signed request using a request generator that executes on a network-accessible server computer (**column 7, lines 19-25; note that printer server 105 is utilized to execute the secure controlling of printing**).

(4) regarding claims 4 and 15:

Kurishita et al. further disclose the method of claim 1, wherein generating a

signed request comprises generating a signed request that includes an identification

code of the printing device (**column 8, lines 29-35; note that secure processing is

performed based on the printer identification code or name**).

(5) regarding claim 5:

Kurishita et al. further disclose the method of claim 4, wherein generating a

signed request comprises generating a signed request that further includes at least one

of an expiration time, an identification of a client, and an identification of a service

provider (**column 10, lines 17-24; note that user's information is selected as a

signed request**).

(6) regarding claims 8 and 17:

Kurishita et al. further disclose the method of claim 1, wherein validating the

signed request comprises validating the signed request using a request validator that

executes on the printing device (**column 1, lines 37-43; note that user goes to the

printing device to authenticate**).

(7) regarding claims 11 and 19:

Kurishita et al. disclose all of the subject matter as described as above except for specifically teaching, wherein enabling or disabling the printing mode comprises enabling or disabling reduced-toner printing.

However, Kawamoto et al. teach wherein enabling or disabling the printing mode comprises enabling or disabling reduced-toner printing (**column 11, lines 60-65; note that the color processing mode can be changed every page in the printer so that the toner can be reduced and a print throughput can be improved**).

Kurishita et al. and Kawamoto et al. are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor which is network printing method. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art wherein enabling or disabling the printing mode comprises enabling or disabling reduced-toner printing. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been in order to save time it takes to change different modes (column 1, lines 47-50). Also, such method also improves print quality (column 1, lines 44-47). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Kurishita et al. with Kawamoto et al. to obtain the invention as specified in claim 11.

(8) regarding claim 12:

Kurishita et al. disclose all of the subject matter as described as above except for specifically teaching, wherein enabling or disabling the printing mode comprises enabling or disabling CMYK printing.

However, Kawamoto et al. teach wherein enabling or disabling the printing mode comprises enabling or disabling CMYK printing (**column 2, lines 10-15; note that the color processing mode is determined by a page unit of the print data**).

Kurishita et al. and Kawamoto et al. are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor which is network printing method. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art wherein enabling or disabling the printing mode comprises enabling or disabling CMYK printing. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been in order to save time it takes to change different modes (column 1, lines 47-50). Also, such method also improves print quality (column 1, lines 44-47). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Kurishita et al. with Kawamoto et al. to obtain the invention as specified in claim 12.

4.   Claims 6-7, 9-10, 16, 18 and 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kurishita et al. (US Patent Number 7,100,198 B2) and Kawamoto et al. (US Patent Number 6,120,197) as applied to claim 1 above and further in view of Slick et al. (US Patent Number 7,111,322 B2).

(1) regarding claims 6, 16 and 21:

Kurishita et al. and Kawamoto et al. disclose all of the subject matter as described as above except for specifically teaching, wherein generating a signed request comprises generating a digital signature using a private key.

However, Slick et al. disclose wherein generating a signed request comprises generating a digital signature using a private key (**column 1, lines 29-30; note that private key is generally maintained within the printer and in column 2, lines 38-41, it is stated that a key is encrypted within the printer itself. Also, in column 16, lines 39-42, the key used is a digital signature**).

Kurishita et al. and Kawamoto et al. and Slick et al. are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor i.e. network printing. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art wherein generating a signed request comprises generating a digital signature using a private key. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to utilize advanced security for the printing modes (column 1, lines 16-22). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Kurishita et al. with Kawamoto et al. with Slick et al. to obtain the invention as specified in claim 6.

(2) regarding claim 7:

Kurishita et al. and Kawamoto et al. disclose all of the subject matter as described as above except for specifically teaching, wherein generating a digital signature comprises generating a digital signature using an identification code of the printing device.

However, Slick et al. disclose wherein generating a digital signature comprises generating a digital signature using an identification code of the printing device (**column**

2, lines 38-41; note that it is stated that a key is encrypted within the printer itself.

Also, in column 16, lines 39-42, the key used is a digital signature).

Kurishita et al. and Kawamoto et al. and Slick et al. are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor i.e. network printing. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art wherein generating a digital signature comprises generating a digital signature using an identification code of the printing device. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to utilize advanced security for the printing modes (column 1, lines 16-22). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Kurishita et al. with Kawamoto et al. with Slick et al. to obtain the invention as specified in claim 7.

(3) regarding claim 9:

Kurishita et al. and Kawamoto et al. disclose all of the subject matter as described as above except for specifically teaching, wherein validating the signed request comprises determining if a digital signature of the signed request is valid.

However, Slick et al. disclose wherein validating the signed request comprises determining if a digital signature of the signed request is valid (**column 2, lines 42-44; note that the key i.e. digital signature as described in column 16, lines 39-42, gets validated**).

Kurishita et al. and Kawamoto et al. and Slick et al. are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor i.e. network printing. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art wherein validating the

signed request comprises determining if a digital signature of the signed request is

valid. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to utilize advanced

security for the printing modes (column 1, lines 16-22). Therefore, it would have been

obvious to combine Kurishita et al. with Kawamoto et al. with Slick et al. to obtain the

invention as specified in claim 9.

(4) regarding claims 10, 18 and 22:

Kurishita et al. and Kawamoto et al. disclose all of the subject matter as

described as above except for specifically teaching, wherein determining if a digital

signature is valid comprises decrypting the digital signature using a public key.

However, Slick et al. disclose wherein determining if a digital signature is valid

comprises decrypting the digital signature using a public key (**column 1, line 65-

column 2, lines 4; note that the validated key gets checked on the public key by

performing a hashing algorithm over the key. Also, the network device utilizes a

corresponding encryption key of the new encryption keypair to decrypt the

encrypted print job**).

Kurishita et al. and Kawamoto et al. and Slick et al. are combinable because they

are from the same field of endeavor i.e. network printing. At the time of the invention, it

would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art wherein determining if

a digital signature is valid comprises decrypting the digital signature using a public key.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to utilize advanced security for

the printing modes (column 1, lines 16-22). Therefore, it would have been obvious to

combine Kurishita et al. with Kawamoto et al. with Slick et al. to obtain the invention as

specified in claim 10.

Conclusion

1.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

Nezu (US Patent Number 5,970,228) discloses a method of maintaining security

in a common output means and system for maintaining security.

Sung et al. (US Patent Number 5,524,181) disclose a method for changing color

printing mode or substituting marking materials in a highlight color printing machine.

Volkoff et al. (US Patent Number 7,073,174) disclose use of job tickets to

secure resource access.

2.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communication from the

examiner should be directed to Hilina Kassa whose telephone number is (571) 270-

1676.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, David Moore could be reached at (571) 272- 7437. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published

applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For

more information about PAIR system, see http://pari-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have

questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business

Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO

Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call

800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Hilina S Kassa/

Examiner, Art Unit 2625

March 14, 2008

/Gabriel I Garcia/

Acting SPE of Art Unit 2625